

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CITY OF MESA
MINUTES OF THE
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
FEBRUARY 4, 2009

A meeting of the Design Review Board was held in the Lower Level of the Council Chambers 57 East First Street, at 4:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Nielsen - Chair
Wendy LeSueur – Vice Chair
Vince DiBella
Tom Bottomley
Craig Boswell
Greg Lambright

MEMBERS ABSENT

Delight Clark (excused)

OTHERS PRESENT

Lesley Davis
Debbie Archuleta
John Wesley
Angelica Guevara
Tom Ellsworth
Gordon Sheffield
Sean Lake
Casil Libman
Others

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

1. Work Session:

CASE: Concierge RV Storage
2260 E Main

REQUEST: Review of a 4.87 acre RV sales and storage facility

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Concerned with the canopy details
- Concerned that the lighting would be visible
- Canopies along Main Street should be different
- Look at attaching a decorative grill to the canopies along Main

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Need decorative canopies along Main
- Could support not having landscape islands in the parking area if there were enhanced landscaping along Main

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Concerned with views from the adjacent residential properties

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- Do the canopies need to be 16'?
- Will the canopies be sprinkled?
- The canopy along Main should be really good architecture
- If the canopy is unique that could almost be like signage, people would notice this site as they drive down Main past all the other RV sites

Boardmember Greg Lambright:

- The canopy along Main needs to be decorative
- The canopy could step up and down as well as in and out
- Typically canopies are only 14'-6" at the bottom

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE: TCF Bank
2750 E Lindsay

REQUEST: Review of a 3,500 sq. ft. bank

DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Vince DiBella:

- Why isn't the entrance at the taller tower?
- Hierarchy should be the taller tower
- Could eliminate parking to provide more of an entrance along University
- Tower is 4' taller than 30' maximum height
- Is the barrel roof tile new?

Chair Tim Nielsen:

- University is a more traveled road
- Entry should be most visible
- Could the tower be different at the top?
- The tower is very tall

Boardmember Tom Bottomley:

- Could the tower come down about 2' so the proportions are not so equal?
- Concerned with the orange color, it doesn't seem to work well with the other two colors
- Could the stucco below the windows be a colored spandrel glass?
- Maybe the middle color could be different, more tan/beige than green

Boardmember Wendy LeSueur:

- Tower seems tall for the building
- Could the accent color be a different material instead of all stucco?
- The sage will get trimmed into a cube or sphere, the yucca will be left alone. Prefer the yucca
- Don't let the plants block the accent elements

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

A. Call to Order:

Chair Tim Nielsen called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

B. Approval of the Minutes of the January 7, 2009 Meeting:

On a motion by Craig Boswell seconded by Vince DiBella the Board unanimously approved the minutes.

C. Take Action on all Consent Agenda items:

D. Design Review Cases:

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

CASE #: DR09-04 Fry's Fuel Center

LOCATION/ADDRESS: 4440 East Main Street

REQUEST: Approval of a (43'x126') 5,418 sq. ft. fuel canopy and a (8'x14') 112 sq. ft. kiosk

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 5

OWNER: Fry's Food Stores of Arizona

APPLICANT: Kim Filuk, KDF/JMF Architects LLC

ARCHITECT: Dan Filuk, KDF/JMF Architects LLC

STAFF PLANNER: Wahid Alam, AICP

REQUEST: Approval of a 4,968 sq. ft. fuel canopy and a 112 sq. ft. kiosk

SUMMARY: This case was removed from the consent agenda due to a conflict by Boardmember Craig Boswell.

Staffmember Wahid Alam stated staff is eliminating condition 1h from the staff report, pertaining to required landscaping, because it will be covered by the Board of Adjustment case.

MOTION: It was moved by Vince DiBella and seconded by Tom Bottomley that DR09-04 be approved with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with the development as described in the Design Review Board staff report and as shown on the site plan, landscape plan, floor plans and exterior elevations with the following modifications to be provided to Planning staff for review and approval at least one week prior to submitting construction documents to the Building Safety Division:
 - a. Electrical equipment must be screened or recessed to comply with §11-15-4
 - b. Planning Staff to review and approve manufacturer and glazing for windows
 - c. Vending Machines and Ice Machine to be screened. Planning Staff to review and approve screening
 - d. Installation of decorative bollards, knee wall, or similar material approved by Planning staff within the kiosk foundation base.
 - e. Install screen walls or berming/landscaping along Main Street per 11-15-4(B)10.
 - f. Retention Basins shall be designed per 11-15-3(D)1-9.
 - g. Provide plant materials per 11-15-3(A) and 11-15-3(B).
 - h. Provide revised color and material board to match the final submittal.
2. Compliance with all requirements of the Building Safety Division with regard to the issuance of building permits.
3. Compliance with all condition of approvals for Board of Adjustment case # BA09-004.
4. Compliance with all City development codes and regulations.
5. Compliance with all requirements of the Development Services, Engineering, Transportation, and Solid Waste Departments.
6. Compliance with all requirements of the Subdivision Regulations if the pad/building sites are to be individually owned or if there is to be a condominium form of ownership.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2008 DESIGN REVIEW MEETING

7. All backflow preventers 2" or larger shall be screened with landscape material located within a 6' radius of the backflow preventer. All backflow preventers less than 2" shall be placed in a wire mesh basket *and painted green. (The City of Mesa has requested the change to green, to discourage theft.)*
8. Fire risers, building downspouts and roof access ladders are to be located within the building.
9. Provide two half size color elevations, one full size and one 8-1/2 X 11 set of reproducible revised site plans, landscaping plans and elevations showing compliance with conditions of approval for this case to the Design Review Staff prior to submitting for building permit application.

VOTE: Passed 5 – 0 – 1 Boardmember Craig Boswell abstained

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

- E. Discuss, receive comment and recommend to City Council the following Design Review Cases:

None

- F. Discuss, receive comment and take action on the following appeals of Administrative Design Review:

None

- G. Other business:

1. Hear a presentation by Gordon Sheffield regarding progress made to date on the Zoning Ordinance update.

Gordon Sheffield gave a presentation the Zoning Ordinance update.

Mr. Sheffield reminded the Board of the makeup of the Technical Review Committee which consists of two members from various citizen advisory boards, including the Design Review Board. He stated the project is approximately $\frac{3}{4}$ complete. He stated one of the main goals of the Code update is to make it easier to understand. Some of the things they are proposing are to make the code more of a table format, and use more descriptive terms such as NC for neighborhood commercial instead of C-1. They are also proposing to increase lot coverage in order to encourage redevelopment on older R1-6 lots. One proposal is to create a new "RSL" district which would be similar to R1-6-PAD, however, it would have qualifying design standards.

Another proposal is to remove stories from height standards and simply have maximum feet. Another proposal is to have pedestrian, mixed, and auto related designators for multi-family and commercial districts.

Some other goals of the new Code would be to encourage mixed employment districts and Transit Oriented Districts. Provide more form based options like those proposed at the Mesa proving Grounds.

Chair Tim Nielsen questioned how much encroachment would be allowed in the R1-6 districts and whether the City would change the zoning for pedestrian or mixed use areas, or would the applicants be required to go through public hearing processes.

Boardmember Vince DiBella confirmed the underlying standards would remain. He was concerned that someone with C-2 zoning who wanted one of the designators would not have to go through a long public hearing process.

Boardmember Greg Lambright wondered if heights would increase with higher densities.

MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 4, 2009 DESIGN REVIEW BOARD

He thought the City should make it easier to make changes in older areas or town and along the Light Rail corridor.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley confirmed the designators would be similar to overlay zones but there would be standards. He liked the idea of allowing more height and increased densities to allow for more variety. He wanted to see change.

Boardmember Greg Lambright confirmed the Engineering Standards are not part of this process. He stated the Planning and Zoning process has always been easy, it's the Engineering process that scares people off. The City needs to make that side of development as easy and well thought out as the zoning side of development. He stated Planning staff has always been very easy to work with; however, Engineering is not.

Boardmember Tom Bottomley did not want to see Engineering become a stumbling block to the proposed changes.

Boardmember Vince DiBella stated that Engineering is the same in every City. They are always hard to work with.

H. Adjournment:

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Archuleta
Planning Assistant

da